

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Non-Final Office Action mailed on November 29, 2002. Claims 1-13 are now pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,936).

The system taught by Lauer is a network management system. "Referring to FIG. 3, the systems architecture of the preferred embodiment of the present invention, referred to as a Signaling Network Management System 300 (SNMS), is illustrated." '936 patent, col. 4, lines 33-36. "Referring now to FIG. 4, a high-level process flowchart illustrates the logical system components of SNMS 300." '936 patent, col. 6, lines 32-33.

The Lauer system collects network events. "The Receive Network Events component 404, which runs primarily on the Alarming Server 302, receives network events.... The Receive Network Events process 404 is shown in greater detail in FIG. 6." '936 patent, col. 6, lines 42-51. "Referring now to FIG. 6, the detailed process of the Receive Network Events component 404 is illustrated. This component collects events from the SS7 network elements via data transport mechanisms.... In steps 602 and 604, events from the SS7 network elements are collected by mainframe applications external to SNMS 300...." '936 patent, col. 9, lines 25-34.

If the network events collected by match a specific profile, then the Lauer system takes action. Otherwise, the network event is discarded. "SNMS 300 maintains a Signaling Event List 608 of all SS7 event types that is to be processed. In step 606, SNMS 300 checks the Signaling Event List 608 and if the current event is found in the list, SNMS 300 traps the event for processing. If the event is not found in the list, SNMS 300 discards it." '936 patent, col. 9, lines 43-48.

Thus, the Lauer system collects more network events than are processed by the Lauer system, and then discards the extra network events that were collected.

In contrast, claim 1 claims in part that: "the engine module selects to retrieve a network event from one or more of the sites using the configuration information". Thus, claim 1 uses configuration information to retrieve network events. Because Lauer indiscriminately retrieves network events, rather than selectively retrieve network events, Lauer teaches the very opposite

of claim 1. Lauer retrieves all network events, and then selectively discards or keeps the retrieved network events. Lauer is thus the opposite of claim 1, which retrieves network events not indiscriminately, but instead by selecting the network events to retrieve, using the configuration information. Claims 4, 5, and 7 depend from claim 1 and are similarly not taught by Lauer.

Similarly, claim 9 claims in part that “the engine selecting to retrieve a network event from one or more of the sites using the configuration information”. Claim 9 also uses configuration information to retrieve network events. Because Lauer indiscriminately retrieves network events, rather than selectively retrieve network events, Lauer teaches the very opposite of claim 9. Lauer is thus the opposite of claim 9, which retrieves network events not indiscriminately, but instead by selecting the network events to retrieve, using the configuration information.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection to claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 12 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609).

In Schwartz, a link server exchanges information with a mobile device. The exchanged information includes encryption information, and information about the display screen of the mobile device. “[T]he mobile device starts exchanging information with the link server. The exchanged information may establish the encryption keys and the encryption scheme to be used for the session. In addition, the mobile device delivers to the link sever a set of device characteristics information regarding the type and size of the display screen of the mobile device. At 906, the account manager in the link server associates the device information with the session just established. Typically the device information is cached in a memory along with other information about the mobile device. If the mobile device is an authorized device, there is a corresponding account that was established when the mobile device is activated. If the mobile device contacts the link server the first time, an account is established by the account manager. Therefore, the device characteristics information is always associated with the account of the mobile device.” ‘609 patent, col. 17, line 62 to col. 18, line 11.

However, in Schwartz, the selection of what network events to retrieve is based on the real time selections made by a user of the mobile device.

"[T]he user moves arrow 710 downward to the second item. Display screen 716 shows four menu items numbered consecutively. As described above, the downward arrow indicates that there are more items in the next screen. Each of the items has an address identifier. For example, for the first four items, the respective address identifiers may be:

12ab

231a

1629

each address identifier correspond to an address stored in the address buffer of link server 606:

www.abc.com

www.xyzinfo.com

www.financialinfo.com

www.personalweb.com

When the second item (i.e., 231a) is chosen, www.xyzinfo.com is intended. After a predetermined button is pressed (e.g., the soft key OK or the numbered button "2") is pressed, a request including the address identifier for the selection is transmitted to link server device 606 by the client module in mobile device 602 over network 614." '609 patent, col. 16, lines 30-57.

In contrast with Schwartz, claim 12 claims in part: "the engine module selecting to retrieve a web event from one or more web sites using the configuration information." Because Schwartz teaches only the use of real time user selections via mobile device to retrieve network events, Schwartz fails to teach claim 12. Schwartz teaches the use of configuration information only to specify encryption information and information about the display screen of the mobile device, and not to specify web events to retrieve. Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and is similarly not taught by Schwartz.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection to claims 12 and 13.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lauer et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,936) in view of Schwartz et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,473,609).

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1, which claims in part that “the engine module selects to retrieve a network event from one or more of the sites using the configuration information”. Thus, claim 1 uses configuration information to retrieve network events. Because Lauer indiscriminately retrieves network events, rather than selectively retrieve network events, Lauer teaches the very opposite of claim 1. Lauer retrieves all network events, and then selectively discards or keeps the retrieved network events. Lauer is thus the opposite of claim 1, which retrieves network events not indiscriminately, but instead by selecting the network events to retrieve, using the configuration information. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and are similarly neither taught nor suggested by Lauer.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9, which claims in part that “the engine selecting to retrieve a network event from one or more of the sites using the configuration information”. Claim 9 also uses configuration information to retrieve network events. Because Lauer indiscriminately retrieves network events, rather than selectively retrieve network events, Lauer teaches the very opposite of claim 9. Lauer is thus the opposite of claim 9, which retrieves network events not indiscriminately, but instead by selecting the network events to retrieve, using the configuration information. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9 and are similarly neither taught nor suggested by Lauer.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection to claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that they are entitled to a letters patent, and respectfully solicit the Examiner to expedite prosecution of this patent to issuance. Should the Examiner have any questions, Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/24/03

By:



Kenta Suzue

Reg. No. 45,145

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
(650) 3995(Direct Line)
Client No. 021971